UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,069	01/22/2001	Thomas Glenn Hall JR.	RIC00025	2505

25537	7590	05/06/2004

MCI, INC
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT
1133 19TH STREET NW, 10TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
TON, ANTHONY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2661	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 January 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 6 and 8-22</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>5 and 7</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 April 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification Objections

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a) Appropriate Application Serial No. in lines 15, 20, 25 and 29 of page 1 and in line 3 of page 2 should be provided.

b) A table on the top of page 19, which is used to tabulate ATM setup message parameters, has not been labeled by any name.

Examiner suggests adding term "**Table 1**" to the top of the table for being distinguished with other tables in the specification.

c) A table at the bottom of page 38, which is used to tabulate input ATM setup message parameters and value, has not been labeled by any name.

Examiner suggests adding term "**Table 2**" to the top of the table for being distinguished with other tables in the specification.

d) A table on the top of page 39, which is used to tabulate output ATM setup message parameters and value, has not been labeled by any name.

Examiner suggests adding term "**Table 3**" to the top of the table for being distinguished with other tables in the specification.

e) Term "Party Subaddress" in page 39 line 5 (the 4th row of the table that has been objected in the item (d) above) is not proper.

Examiner suggests changing this term to "**Called** Party Subaddress".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2.   **Claims 3, 6, 8 and 14** are objected to because of the following informalities:

a) **In Claim 8**: Term "**an SVC**" in line 3 is not appropriate article.

Examiner suggests changing this term to "**a SVC**".

b) **In Claims 3, 6 and 14**: Term "**the bandwidth**" in **line 8** (for **claim 3**), in **line 6** (for

claim 6), in **line 11** (for **claim 14**) is insufficient antecedent basis.

Examiner suggests changing this term to "**a bandwidth**".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 11, 14, 15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Medhat et al** (Medhat) (US Patent No. **6,314,103**) in view of **Christie et al**

(Christie) (US Patent No. **6,430,195**).

a) **In Regarding to Claim 1**: **Medhat disclosed** an intelligent network for use with an

ATM network to set up an ATM switched virtual circuit to provide VToA services and point-to-

multipoint connectivity _(see Fig.3)_, the intelligent network comprising:

a multi-service control point (MSCP) operable to receive an input extracted from an input

ATM setup message that includes a called party phone number value, a VToA designator _(see_

Fig.3: blocks 110A (MSCP) and 112A (ATM switched virtual circuit), links 230 and 116A; the

MSCP using these two links to receive a call signaling for a call from communication device

202 (calling party), which can communicate with communication device 218 (called party),

hence a called party phone number value and VToA designator are included in the call

signaling in order to setup a call), and a request to establish a point-to-multipoint connection,

enforce policies regarding the establishment of point-to-multipoint connections *(see col.8 lines*

30-41: call admission control "CAC" determines at call setup (a request) whether to grant or

to refuse a connection. If sufficient resources are available to connect a call, and if the call

assignment for a connection does not affect QoS of the existing call connections, then the

connection is granted (enforce policies), when multiple connections are required to setup a call,

the CAC separately checks each VP/VC and VPG for a call (hence a request to establish a

point-to-multipoint connections)), and generate an output in response for use in generating an

output ATM setup message *(see col.2 lines 5-27: the interworking unit is adapted to receive the*

user communications in a communication format and to receive the control message (output)

from the signaling processor (MSCP));

an ATM signaling intercept processor (ASIP) operable to communicate the input to the

multi-service control point, receive the output generated by the multi-service control point,

generate the output ATM setup message using the output, and communicate the output ATM

setup message to the ingress ATM edge switch of the ATM network *(see Figs.3 & 6: In Fig.3,*

blocks 110A and 112A; the block 110A is a signaling processor (ASIP and MSCP) that is used

to manage in both control function and connection function, it is not only treated as a "MSCP",

but sometimes it is also treated as an "ASIP"; and such "MSCP" and "ASIP" are disclosed the

same as that of the instant claim. In Fig.6, block 606 has acted like the MSCP of the instant

claim, whereas blocks 604 and 608 have acted like the ASIP of the instant claim; for more

details see col.21 from line 20 on: The Signaling Processor); and

a service administration operable to provision the multi-service control point and the

ATM signaling intercept processor *(see Fig.3: block 302).*

Medhat failed to explicitly teach an ASIP that is operable to intercept an input ATM

setup message from an ingress ATM edge switch of the ATM network, and extract an input

from the input ATM setup message.

Christie disclosed a signal processor, an ATM MUX, an input ATM setup message from

an ingress ATM edge switch of an ATM network, and extract an input from the input ATM

setup message *(see Figs.11: blocks 1160 and 1150. In which, the signal processor (1160) and*

ATM MUX (1150) are considered as an ASIP and ingress ATM edge switch, respectively; and

see Figs.4-7 and col.6 lines 24-35: in which, IAM "initial address message" is considered as

an input ATM setup message that is intercepted by the signal processor (ASIP) to extract an

input (SS7 IAM) from such an input ATM setup message (IAM)).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to implement such an ASIP throughout the signal processor of Medhat, in

order to provide available bandwidth capacity in broadband systems, **the motivation being** to

utilize bandwidth more efficiently.

b) **In Regarding to Claim 2:** **Medhat further disclosed** wherein the multi-service

control point, in order to enforce policies regarding the establishment of point-to-multipoint

connections, is operable to perform the following:

receive a request from a calling party to establish a point-to-multipoint connection *(see col.8 line 35: when multiple connections (hence point-to-multipoint connection) are required to setup a call (hence receive a request from a calling party); and see Fig.3: communication devices 202, 210 and 218, in which, the communication device 202 can communicate with both communication device 210 and communication device 218 (hence point-to-multipoint communications))*,

determine if the calling party is authorized to make point-to-multipoint connections *(see col.8 lines 30-41: call admission control determines at call setup whether to grant or to refuse a connection)*,

reject the request if the calling party is not authorized to establish point-to-multipoint connections *(see col.12 line 51-col.13 line 6: the call requiring the 1001ˢᵗ VC would have been rejected)*,

analyze the request to determine if the bandwidth requested for the point-to-multipoint connection is within authorized bandwidth limits *(see col.8 lines 32-41: If sufficient resources are available to connect a call, and if the call assignment for a connection does not affect QoS of the existing call connections, then the connection is granted (enforce policies), when multiple connections (hence, point-to-multipoint connection) are required to setup a call, the CAC separately checks each VP/VC and VPG for a call)*, and

reject the request if the bandwidth requested is not within authorized bandwidth limits *(see col.17 lines 23-36: if congestion would occur, allocated for VPs from the second and third bandwidth allocation systems 104B and 104C, then the signaling processor 110A will deny the connection for the next call (hence reject the request))*.

It would have been obvious to combine **Medhat** and **Christie** for the same reason as in

Claim 1.

c) **In Regarding to Claim 3**: **Medhat further disclosed** wherein the multi-service

control point, in order to enforce policies regarding the establishment of point-to-multipoint

connections, is further operable to perform the following:

allow the point-to-multipoint connection to be established if the calling party is

authorized to make point-to-multipoint connections and the bandwidth requested is within

authorized bandwidth limits (*see col.10 lines 13-24*: *The VCs differentiate individual calls on a

VP in a VPG between the interworking unit 112 and the cross connect 108 or the ATM devices

128 and 134, and they identify, for example, the destination of the call. For example, VP/VC

"A" for a VPG may be provisioned (authorized) from the interworking unit 112 (hence the

calling party is authorized to make a connection to a first point), through the cross connect 108,

and "destined" for another interworking unit connected to the first ATM device 128 (the first

point) over the connections 120 and 124. VP/VC "B" for the VPG may be provisioned

(authorized) from the interworking unit 112, through the cross connect 108, and "destined" for

another interworking unit connected to the second ATM device 134 (a second point) over the

connections 122 and 130 (hence the calling party is authorized to make a connection to the

second point; therefore, the calling party (communication device 106) is allowed for point-to-

multipoint connections to ATM devices 128 and 134 as shown in Fig.1))*.

It would have been obvious to combine **Medhat** and **Christie** for the same reason as in

Claim 1.

d) **In Regarding to Claim 11**: **Medhat further disclosed** wherein the multi-service

control point is operable to track the allocated bandwidth of a point-to-multipoint connection

(see col.14 lines 53-65: Each of the RRC and the ERC is used to track bandwidth allocation of

VP/VC assignments for VPGs to determine the current usage and availability of VP/VCs).

It would have been obvious to combine **Medhat** and **Christie** for the same reason as in

Claim 1.

e) **In Regarding to Claims 14 and 15**: These claims are rejected for the same reasons as

claims 2 and 3 (regardless the claimed subject matters as recited in claim 1) because the

apparatus in claims 2 and 3 can be used to practice the method steps of **Claims 14 and 15,**

respectively.

f) **In Regarding to Claim 18**: **Medhat further disclosed** wherein the method uses a

multi-service control point of the intelligent network *(see col.10 lines 57-67: provide*

significant processing or intelligent network functions).

It would have been obvious to combine **Medhat** and **Christie** for the same reason as in

Claim 14.

g) **In Regarding to Claim 19**: **Medhat further disclosed** wherein the method is

performed at an ingress of the ATM network *(see Fig.3: blocks 112A, 112B and 112C).*

It would have been obvious to combine **Medhat** and **Christie** for the same reason as in

Claim 14.

h) **In Regarding to Claim 20**: **Medhat disclosed** all aspects of claim 20 as set forth in

claim 14.

Medhat failed to explicitly teach a request that is received from information generated from an input ATM setup message.

Christie disclosed such a request *(see Figs.4-7 and col.6 lines 24-35: IAM "initial address message" is considered as an input ATM setup message that is received by the signal processor (ASIP) to extract an input (SS7 IAM) from such an input ATM setup message)*.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such a request throughout the signal processor of Medhat, in order to provide available bandwidth capacity in broadband systems, **the motivation being** to utilize bandwidth more efficiently.

4.   **Claims 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 16 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Medhat et al** (Medhat) (US Patent No. **6,314,103**) in view of **Christie et al** (Christie) (US Patent No. **6,430,195**) as applied to Claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of **Malek et al** (Malek) (US Patent No. **6,253,207**).

a) **In Regarding to Claim 4**: **Medhat and Christie disclosed** all aspects of the claim 4 as set forth in the Claim 1, and **Medhat further disclosed** wherein the multi-service control point, in order to enforce policies regarding the establishment of point-to-multipoint connections, is further operable to perform the following:

receive a leaf request from the calling party, and reject the leaf request if the maximum number of leaf nodes has been exceeded, but allow the existing point-to-multipoint connection to proceed without the requested leaf *(Medhat disclosed a call admission control "CAC" (MSCP) that determines at call setup whether to grant or to refuse a connection. If sufficient resources are available to connect a call, and if the call assignment for a connection does not*

affect QoS of the existing call connections, then the connection is granted. When multiple connections are required to setup a call, CAC separately checks each VP/VC and VPG for the call. The CAC may receive operations, administration, and maintenance "OAM" information and process the OAM information to determine connection availability and to determine service and resource allocation and control. see col.8 line 30-41).

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose receive a leaf request from the calling party to add a leaf node to an existing point-to-multipoint connection; and

analyze the leaf request to determine the maximum number of leaf nodes has been exceeded.

Malek explicitly disclosed such adding a party to an existing call (see col.6 lines 44-48: *the media may be utilized, for example, to add additional callers to a conference call in progress).*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such receive a leaf request from the calling party to add a leaf node to an existing point-to-multipoint connection throughout the communication system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to provide a call setup for a calling party to another called party if bandwidth capacity in a broadband system is available, **the motivation being** to utilize a conference call.

Malek disclosed such analyze the leaf request to determine the maximum number of leaf nodes has been exceeded (see col.5 line 61-col.6 line 6: *analyze types of media included in the session and network conditions, and will thereafter determine the desired capacity values)*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such analyze the leaf request to determine the maximum number of leaf nodes has been exceeded throughout the allocating bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to limit capacity of communication devices in a communications system, **the motivation being** to utilize QoS and to avoid a congestion in a conference call.

b) **In Regarding to Claim 6**: **Medhat and Christie disclosed** all aspects of the claim 6 as set forth in the Claim 1.

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose the multi-service control point includes a bandwidth request value that indicates the bandwidth requested for the point-to-multipoint connection.

Malek disclosed such a bandwidth request value that indicates the bandwidth requested for the point-to-multipoint connection *(see col.4 lines 38-46: when a call request arrives, the bandwidth should be allocated to respective component for the duration of the call)*.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such a bandwidth request value that indicates the bandwidth requested for the point-to-multipoint connection throughout the allocating bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to limit capacity of communication devices in a communications system, **the motivation being** to utilize QoS and to avoid a congestion in a conference call.

c) **In Regarding to Claim 8**: **Medhat and Christie disclosed** all aspects of the claim 8 as set forth in the Claim 1.

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose wherein the multi-service control point determines if the input ATM setup message requests a SVC for VToA by analyzing the VToA designator portion of the input.

Malek disclosed such an input ATM setup message requests a SVC for VToA by analyzing the VToA designator portion of the input *(see Fig.8 and col.7 lines 25-64: the multimedia call handler process 800 will analyze the request during step 820 based on media types and network traffic conditions. As previously indicated, network traffic conditions can be obtained, for example, by sending test messages (analyzing), such as Resource Management Cells in an ATM network, from the source to the destination prior to connection set-up, where the network elements along the path would include information (the VToA designator) about their traffic and congestion status, as well as other parameters (hence the VToA designator portion of the input because in an ATM cell, the header is a portion of an input))*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such a bandwidth request value that indicates the bandwidth requested for the point-to-multipoint connection throughout the allocating bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to limit capacity of communication devices in a communications system, **the motivation being** to utilize QoS and to avoid a congestion in a conference call.

d) **In Regarding to Claim 9:** **Medhat and Christie disclosed** all aspects of the claim 9 as set forth in the Claims 1 and 2.

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose the multi-service control point further includes:

a database that correlates point-to-multipoint authorization information with the calling

party, and correlates the called party phone number value with an ATM address of the called

party CPE, and wherein the multi-service control point includes the ATM address of the called

party CPE in the output.

Malek disclosed such a multi-service control point further includes:

a database that correlates point-to-multipoint authorization information with the calling

party *(see Fig.3: block 350, memory device)*, and correlates the called party phone number value

with an ATM address of the called party CPE *(see Fig.5 and col.6 lines 18-48: VPI/VCI value)*,

and wherein the multi-service control point includes the ATM address of the called party CPE

in the output *(see col.4 lines 6-27: the address of destination device)*.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to implement such a multi-service control point throughout the allocating

bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to provide a voice communication

over an ATM system, **the motivation being** to utilize bandwidth efficiency.

e) **In Regarding to Claims 10 and 12:** **Medhat and Christie disclosed** all aspects of

the claims 10 and 12 as set forth in the Claim 1, and **Medhat further disclosed** the multi-

service control point is operable to track the allocated bandwidth of a point-to-multipoint

connection as recited in **claim 12** *(see col.14 lines 53-65: Each of the RRC and the ERC is used*

to track bandwidth allocation of VP/VC assignments for VPGs to determine the current usage

and availability of VP/VCs).

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose wherein the multi-service

control point is operable to track the number of leaf nodes of a point-to-multipoint connection

as recited in **Claims 10 and 12**. *However, Medhat disclosed bandwidth allocation systems manage VP allocation and usage by VPGs on a point code basis. There is a relationship established for connections at the point code level between communication devices in a telecommunication system. This allows the bandwidth allocation systems <u>to track the established connections</u> between the bandwidth allocation systems and other devices in the telecommunication system (see col.14 lines 44-52). Although Medhat failed to explicitly disclose that the MSCP is operable to track the number of leaf nodes of a point-to-multipoint connection, Medhat clearly disclosed tracking the established connections between the bandwidth allocation systems and other devices in the telecommunication system; therefore, it is obviously that Medhat imply disclosed such a tracking of the instant claim.*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such a tracking a number of leaf nodes throughout the allocating bandwidth system of Medhat in order to utilize a voice communication over an ATM system, **the motivation being** to utilize bandwidth efficiency.

f) **In Regarding to Claim 13**: **Medhat and Christie disclosed** all aspects of the claim 13 as set forth in the Claim 1, and *Medhat further disclosed broadband systems to provide telecommunications providers with many benefits, including greater bandwidth, more efficient use of bandwidth, and the ability to integrate voice, data, and video communications (<u>see col.1 lines 56-62</u>).*

However, Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose wherein the content exchanged through a point-to-multipoint connection includes video.

Malek disclosed such content exchanged through a point-to-multipoint connection includes video (see Fig.4: Block 410, video).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such a multi-service control point throughout the allocating bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to integrate voice and video communications in broadband systems, the motivation being provide more efficient use of bandwidth and reduce costs.

g) In Regarding to Claim 16: This claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 4 (regardless the claimed subject matters as recited in claim 1) because the apparatus in claim 4 can be used to practice the method steps of Claim 16.

h) In Regarding to Claim 17: Medhat and Christie disclosed all aspects of the claim 17 as set forth in the Claims 14 and 16.

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose a leaf request is provided as an ATM add party message.

Malek disclosed such a leaf request is provided as an ATM add party message (see col.5 lines 2-19: The payload 234 contains user information, signaling information or operation (leaf request), ATM, a leaf node, VPI/VCI).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such a multi-service control point throughout the allocating bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Malek in order to integrate voice over ATM systems, the motivation being provide more efficient use of bandwidth.

5.   Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Medhat et al (US Patent No. 6,314,103) in view of Christie et al (US Patent No. 6,430,195) as

applied to Claim 14 above, and further in view of Eliot et al (Eliot) (US Patent No. 6,614,781).

Medhat and Christie disclosed all aspects of the claims 21 & 22 as set forth in claim 14.

Both Medhat and Christie failed to explicitly disclose wherein determining if the

calling party is authorized to make point-to-multipoint connections is achieved using a profile

associated with the calling party as recited in Claim 21; and wherein determining if the calling

party is authorized to make point-to-multipoint connections is achieved using a customer profile

that is associated with the calling party as recited in Claim 22.

Elliot disclosed *a soft switch site to instructs a gateway site for collecting account codes,*

and using the information in the customer profile, the soft switch site can use the Internet

Protocol Device Control protocol to instruct the gateway site to collect a specified number of

digits from a calling party (hence using a profile/customer profile associated with the calling

party) (see Fig.22C-1: step 2210; and see col.22 lines 60-64: customer profile to collect a

specified number of digits from calling party).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to implement such using a profile and customer profile throughout the

allocating bandwidth system of Medhat, as taught by Eliot in order collect account codes of

customers in broadband systems, the motivation being to query a customer profile database for

retrieving the originating trigger plan associated with calling customer more efficiently.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   **Claims 5 and 7** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony T Ton whose telephone number is 703-305-8956. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W Olms can be reached on 703-305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ATT
4/27/2004

KENNETH VANDERPUYE
PRIMARY EXAMINER